



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,290	10/22/2003	Scott Douglas Frei	ROC920030290US1	2244
7590 Grant A. Johnson IBM Corporation Dept. 917 3605 Highway 52 North Rochester, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,290

Applicant(s)

FREI ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas Augustine

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed: 08/23/2007.
- B. Claims 1-14 remains pending. Claims 15-22 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over George Francis DeStefano (US 6,075,531), herein referred to as "DeStefano" in view of Bhogal et al (US 6,806,888), herein referred to as "Bhogal".

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

As for independent claims 1 and 9, DeStefano teaches a method and corresponding apparatus comprising: presenting a plurality of windows on an output device (figure 10, col.5, lines 7-19; wherein the user on a computer system is running an application and is connected in a distributed computing environment wherein the application being ran can be ran on another machine thru means of a server or direct connection within the distributed computing environment); wherein each of the plurality of windows displays a respective application and a respective group identifier that indicates a respective group

to which the respective application in the respective window belongs, wherein at least one of the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an auxiliary output device (figure 11; col.13, lines 10-67 and col.14, lines 1-6; wherein the user groups application windows together and the grouping is indicated with an icon of currently selected windows in a group, from there the user can manipulate the group in such as moving it to another screen connected to the computer and since the computer system is connected in a distribution computing environment that other device can be a another computer system which has a projector as a display (col.5, lines 20-29) when of course doing so that user can pick and choose what windows to manipulate which in a sense is denying specific content form the users computer system to be displayed on another computer system whom which has a projector as a computer display which has a graphical indicator of selected windows being manipulated); selecting a subset of the plurality of windows; and sending the subset to the auxiliary output device (figure 14; wherein the user can select a group of windows and display them on a connected computer system in a distributed computing environment). The use of a distributed computing system to achieve the predicted results of displaying a program from one display device to another would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art for what is commonly known about distributed computer environment (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distributed_computing). However to further support the DeStefano, since DeStefano does not expressly teach taking content from one display and displaying it to another display Bhogal, in the same field of endeavor, teaches selecting a portion of a first display and displaying it to a second

Art Unit: 2179

display, in such that the first display is viewed by the presenter and the second display is viewed by the audience, thus Bhogal teaches wherein at least one of the respective group identifiers indicates that the respective window is not to be sent to an auxiliary output device (figures 2-3; col.2, lines 45-55; col.4, lines 8-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bhogal into DeStefano because both Bhogal and DeStefano teach methods of display screen management (col.1, lines 11-16).

As for dependent claims 2 and 10, DeStefano teaches the method and corresponding apparatus of claims 1 and 9, wherein the auxiliary output device comprises a projector (col.5, line 24).

As for dependent claims 3 and 11, DeStefano teaches the method and corresponding apparatus of claims 1 and 9, wherein the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on group affiliations of the plurality of windows (figure 11).

As for dependent claim 4, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on a list of allowed applications (figure 11, wherein the user selects what application windows to group together, acts as an author of what gets grouped and what does not get grouped to be further displayed elsewhere on the display or another; note the analysis of claim 1 above).

Art Unit: 2179

As for dependent claim 5, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on a list of disallowed applications (note the analysis of claim 4 above; wherein the user can select any subset on the display device to manipulate in anyway).

As for dependent claims 6 and 13, DeStefano teaches the method and corresponding apparatus of claims 1 and 9, wherein the selecting further comprises: detecting that an application has launched; and determining whether the application belongs to a selected group (figures 18-19).

As for dependent claims 7 and 14, DeStefano teaches the method and corresponding apparatus of claims 1 and 9, wherein the selecting further comprises: detecting that an application has been brought into focus; and determining whether the application belongs to a group (figure 17).

As for dependent claim 8, DeStefano teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: changing the subset that is sent to the auxiliary output device (figure 16).

As for dependent claim 12, DeStefano teaches the apparatus of claim 11, further comprising: means for displaying the group affiliations in the respective windows (figure

Art Unit: 2179 .

11; indication of a group).

(Note:) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Augustine
Examiner
AU: 2179

N. Augustine
November 21, 2007


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER